## Case 8:17-cr-00472-PX Document 191 Filed 04/03/18 Page 1 of 88

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND SOUTHERN DIVISION

- - - - - - - - - X

Defendant.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

: Criminal No. 17-00472-PX

V.

:

DAWN J. BENNETT,

: September 21, 2017

---x Greenbelt, Maryland

## BAIL REVIEW HEARING

BEFORE: THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN

APPEARANCES: ERIN B. PULICE, Esq.

THOMAS P. WINDOM, Esq.

Office of the United State's Attorney

6500 Cherrywood Lane

Suite 400

Greenbelt, Maryland 20770
On Behalf of the Government

MARK E. SCHAMEL, Esq.

Wombie Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC

1200 19th Street NW

Suite 500

Washington, DC 20036

On Behalf of the Defendant

STEVEN GREMMINGER, Esq.

Gremminger Law Firm

5335 Wisconsin Avenue NW

Suite 440

Washington, DC 20015

On Behalf of the Defendant

Also Present: James Ridgeway, Pre Trial Services

Keith Custer, Special Agent

Audio Operator: Brandon Mottley

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

*CompuScribe* 301/577-5882

Transcription Company: CompuScribe

5100 Forbes Boulevard

2

Suite 101

Lanham, MD 20706 (301) 577-5882

## $\underline{I}$ $\underline{N}$ $\underline{D}$ $\underline{E}$ $\underline{X}$

	<u>Page</u>
Preliminary Matters	4
Comments by Thomas P. Windom, Esq. Attorney for the Government	9
Comments by Mark E. Schamel, Esq. Attorney for the Defendant	10
Comments by James Ridgeway Pretrial Services Officer	37
Comments by Judge Timothy J. Sullivan	76
Findings and Ruling by Judge Timothy J. Sullivan	79
Motion for Steven Gremminger, Esq. to withdraw from case:	
Ruling by Judge Timothy J. Sullivan	82

3

nm |

```
1
                         PROCEEDINGS
2
              (Whereupon, at 2:06 p.m., the proceeding began.)
3
              THE CLERK: Government, call the case, please. Have
4
    a seat.
5
              MR. WINDOM: Good afternoon, Your Honor. We are
   here on United States versus Dawn Bennett, PX-17-472 for
6
7
    purposes of bail review hearing.
8
              Thomas Windom and Erin Pulice for the United States.
9
    With us at counsel table is Special Agent Keith Custer*.
10
              MS. PULICE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
11
              THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon to both of
12
    you.
13
              MR. GREMMINGER: Your Honor, my name is Steve
    Gremminger. This is Dawn Bennett. I have with me today
14
15
    Mr. Schamel who has requested leave of court to enter a
16
    special appearance and to appear on behalf of the Defendant
17
    along with me.
18
              THE COURT: Sure.
19
              MR. GREMMINGER: And we request leave that he be
20
    permitted to do so.
21
              THE COURT: Sure. So let's talk about that first.
22
    And as the parties know Judge Xinis sent me an attorney
23
    inquiry referral today.
24
              Counsel, you can come up.
25
              MR. SCHAMEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

MR. GREMMINGER: Thank you.

THE COURT: This is a real mess. And, you know,

Ms. Bennett, you will find very quickly that I am not

Judge DiGirolamo. And I am really unhappy. And if I am

unhappy, you can assume that the district judge is unhappy.

We don't have like limited special super-duper temporary maybe just -- maybe for a one minute hearing attorney representations. And we don't even have local counsel in criminal cases. Any attorney in the country can come and represent a criminal defendant in this court.

So there is no such thing, Counsel -- you can have seat. There is no such thing as local counsel in a criminal case. And you can't hide behind the fact that you are local counsel because once you are in, you are in.

We have one exception in this court, and it has been the practice -- I was a criminal defense attorney for 26 years in this building and in Baltimore before I became a magistrate judge. We dealt with the rule one, which we all know what that is, if you show up at an initial appearance for a criminal defendant, the court will give you the limited ability to enter your appearance for that proceeding.

And then if you enter, then you are in. And that would allow the parties, the defendant, and the attorney to figure out if they can resolve rule one, which we all know is the ability to pay. And the court is very flexible at that

point about either having another attorney inquiry hearing if the defendant can't pay and may qualify for court appointed counsel, or whether the defendant is going to shop around and try to get retained counsel, counsel of choice, at that point.

But by my count -- by my count, there have been at least four lawyers who have had some kind of -- there is a guy in New Mexico, the guy in New York City, Mr. Morvillo\* -- whatever his name is, you, and you. So this case is like brand spanking new and we are having trouble with Ms. Bennett's attorneys and it is going to stop right now.

So I will let you participate today under this novel downtown lawyer thing called -- whatever it is called. I never even heard of it before and I will probably spend a lot of time trying to figure out exactly what to call it -- the conditional limited appearance. I am not even sure what that means, but I have no intention of jamming up any lawyer. And I know the pain of getting in a case when the client can't pay or won't pay. And we are not going to -- I am never going to force a defense attorney to stay in a case because it creates all kinds of problems.

But the other side is I am never, ever, ever going to allow a criminal defendant to manipulate, to use her counsel of choice ability under the Sixth Amendment like a carrousel to keep this case from moving forward.

So if I have to have attorney inquiry hearings every

other day, we are -- somebody is going to enter a full appearance in this case to represent Ms. Bennett. And we may not have to -- we are going to get to it at some point today. But for the purposes of where we are and what we are here today for, which is a bail review hearing, I will let both of counsel participate and protect the interests of Ms. Bennett.

But, Ms. Bennett, if you haven't figured this out already, you got to hire a lawyer and that lawyer is going to enter his or her appearance and that is it. We are not going to have this carrousel of four -- I mean, as -- the only thing I agreed with your motion was that the -- you know, we have had so many procedural irregularities in this case already and it is brand new.

And that, I guess, is bad news that you guys got me.

But that is going to stop. It is going to stop.

Ms. Bennett, you have got to lawyer-up one way or the other. You either hire a lawyer or you ask the Court to consider appointment of counsel for you because you can't afford counsel, or you represent yourself. Those are the three -- any criminal defendant has those three rights.

And we will talk more about a time table for you to either, retain counsel and have that counsel enter his or her appearance. I don't want you without counsel. That is why I am keeping your lawyers in now; one who is already in who is like shaking his head saying, "I don't know why I ever

answered that phone call." And the other one who is trying to -- I think based on the representations, trying to figure out if a representation agreement can be reached with you. And I understand that takes time too, especially in cases like this.

But for the purposes of today, and today only, I will allow both lawyers to participate in this hearing. So that is where we are for the attorney inquiry.

So let me run back some landscape on what I have been able to catch up with.

MR. SCHAMEL: Your Honor?

THE COURT: I have listened to all the hearings in front of Judge DiGirolamo and to my understanding, unless I am missing something -- my understanding is we are here today for a bail review hearing based on the August 29th, 2017 memorandum that Judge DiGirolamo -- from James Ridgeway, the location monitoring specialist, in which Judge DiGirolamo was notified of an apparent violation by Ms. Bennett for basically -- like within hours of a hearing and without -- within hours of trying to get installed on electronic monitoring based on Judge DiGirolamo's conditions of release.

And in that memo he viewed the Defendant's non-compliance as serious and respectfully recommended a prompt bail review hearing.

In the interim, I am familiar with the fact that Judge DiGirolamo modified a component of the release

25

1	conditions and had a hearing on September 14th about that
2	where counsel defense counsel participated by phone and
3	where the Government, I think, moved for detention at that
4	point and Judge DiGirolamo left the conditions of release as
5	he had imposed them and modified them. And in a very
6	collegial-like way said, you know, Judge Sullivan can deal
7	with this.
8	So that is my understanding of why we are here.
9	Government, do you agree with that, not agree with
10	it? Is there more nuance than that? What is the
11	MR. WINDOM: That is why we are here. The
12	Government investigated further after receiving the violation
13	notice from Pretrial. We have additional evidence to present
14	to the Court involving Ms. Bennett's rampant, brazen
15	violations of the release order in this case.
16	So the Government would like to begin by asking
17	Pretrial if there is anything further to add to its report.
18	THE COURT: Let me before we get down that road,
19	do you want to tell me that you are not prepared, that you
20	need time to prepare, that you are totally surprised by this,
21	that your client is prejudiced by this?
22	But I will then say to you, well, the gentleman on
23	the other side has been in this case, so you should be ready
24	to go today.

MR. SCHAMEL: No, that is not what I was going to

```
1 say, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. SCHAMEL: Good morning, Your Honor. Mark 4 Schamel.

5 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. Hi.

MR. SCHAMEL: I am here for Ms. Bennett and I appreciate your -- first let me say, Your Honor, you are right. The reason Your Honor doesn't know what that motion is is that is the, sort of, the machinations of my mind to try to find a way to convey to the Court exactly what the Court took from it.

I would be happy to go into more detail if Your Honor would like at the bench. Not ex parte, of course, with the Government, if you want to know a little bit more about it.

But I would like to, before we begin, Your Honor, just -- I want Your Honor to be in the right frame of mind before we start into the actual hearing because this is not Ms. Bennett's doing. The fact that Ms. Bennett is sitting next to Mr. Gremminger and myself is not by her choice, frankly. She had lawyers. She had lawyers for a significant period of time. This is a case that originated with an SEC referral from Philadelphia that has been going on for well over a year.

My understanding of what she has paid those two

25

```
1
    individuals from New York to represent her is pretty
    significant and what I would expect for a month's long trial
    here in this district. So the fact that she doesn't have
3
4
    those lawyers at the last minute is not a gamesmanship by her
    and I want Your Honor to know that.
5
6
              THE COURT: Okay. That is fine. I accept that.
7
    Okay.
8
              MR. SCHAMEL: And as far as Mr. Gremminger, he --
9
    with all due respect to Mr. Gremminger -- I have known him for
10
    a number of years -- is a tax lawyer. He is a former DOJ tax
11
    lawyer. He is not a criminal defense lawyer.
12
              Apparently neither he nor the other gentlemen from
13
    New York were aware of the issue on local counsel and had that
14
    hearing. So Mr. Gremminger -- when I talked to Mr. Gremminger
15
    about this case -- when I saw his name and I talked to
16
    Ms. Bennett about this case, I wanted to help.
17
              So I just -- I want Your Honor to know this is not
18
    gamesmanship. It is exactly as you see from my
19
    representations, --
20
              THE COURT: Yes.
21
              MR. SCHAMEL: -- is that I am trying to figure out
22
    if I can get in. The fact that all of the other lawyers in
23
    this case have been subpoenaed for their billing records and
24
    their engagement agreements has -- obviously, I have, you
```

know, traps that have to run at my firm about whether or not

25

did.

```
1
    that is something we are going to undertake. So I was
    comfortable having her here today and not letting
3
    Mr. Gremminger be on his own for his first bail hearing.
4
              THE COURT: Right. Look, I -- you know, I have no
5
    information that Ms. Bennett is trying to game anything. I am
6
    just, you know, telling you and Ms. Bennett, given my
7
    experiences, that we are not going to have a lot of back and
8
    forth about attorneys. And that this is the same for
9
    Ms. Bennett, for any other criminal defendant. You hire a
10
    lawyer and let's get moving down the road. It is that simple.
11
              And, you know, nobody -- you know, look the Supreme
12
    Court has made it known over, and over, and over, and over,
13
    and over that the Sixth Amendment means something, and that a
14
    person has the right to their counsel of choice. And it is
15
    not for me or the Government to interfere with that.
16
              But when that pursuit of counsel of choice becomes
17
    detrimental to the speedy resolution of a case and interferes
18
    with the court's dockets, then it becomes a problem. So that
19
    was just the shot that I was shooting out. I have no feelings
20
    one way or another about what Ms. Bennett is doing or not
21
    doing. It is up to her.
22
              MR. SCHAMEL: And I didn't --
23
              THE COURT:
                         Right.
24
              MR. SCHAMEL: -- wasn't inferring that Your Honor
```

```
1
              THE COURT: Right. Okay.
2
                           I just wanted to make sure that we
              MR. SCHAMEL:
3
    were clear that she has been dealing with me in good faith.
4
    And frankly, thought -- I am her second choice. She had
5
    lawyers. She thought those were going to be her lawyers.
6
              THE COURT: Right.
7
              MR. SCHAMEL: And they decided they wouldn't be.
8
              THE COURT: Right. I understand.
9
              MR. SCHAMEL: So I am -- you know, I have known her
10
    for 48 hours and --
11
              THE COURT:
                         Right.
12
              MR. SCHAMEL: -- I am doing the best I can to --
13
              THE COURT: Okay. All right.
14
              MR. SCHAMEL: -- sort of come up to speed.
15
              THE COURT: So we are --
16
              MR. SCHAMEL: On the issue of the hearing -- and I
17
    know where Your Honor is going and I am not disagreeing that
18
    this has been out there since the 29th of August.
19
    Mr. Gremminger has never handled a criminal case. That is not
20
    the reason that he is not ready and I am not ready today.
21
              The reason we are not ready, Your Honor, is we were
22
    just -- and again, I haven't ever had a conversation with
23
    either of these Government prosecutors until this morning when
24
    they walked in. And they have been very cordial and they were
25
    very lovely, and they handed me a couple of spreadsheets right
```

after they served my client. And Your Honor has them in front of you as Government exhibits.

Right after the two FBI agents served my client with a warrant in the back room to search her purse and take her phone. So they served the warrant on her, gave me the spreadsheets and said there's 130, give or take, violations — technical violations. Here they are. Alleged that she has made phone calls from a number of phones that — all news to me, news to Mr. Gremminger. Would not provide that to prior counsel at any time for it.

If Your Honor looks at the multi-colored document that is in front of you -- the multiple-page document that lists those blue, red, yellow -- one of the phone calls there, the yellow one, is actually Mr. Gremminger's phone. This gentleman right here. This lawyer. They are alleging that Ms. Bennett made a call from Mr. Gremminger's phone to one of the witnesses on the list.

They handed us that just now. And in the five to seven minutes before Your Honor took the bench, I had an opportunity to call some numbers on there and actually talked to one of people who is listed on that, and I would be happy ex parte if Your Honor wants to know which person that was. And that person told me that they did in fact talk to Ms. Bennett. I won't deny that that is what they said, but that they have never, ever been asked and never been -- and

allow to register the fact that they want to continue talking to her. They are not -- that person is not a victim, was never defrauded from anything, has ongoing business concerns with Ms. Bennett, should not be on a list of not being able to talk to her.

And contrary to what the Government Counsel, I think, is going to argue, was not -- it was not an intent to influence this person, there no intent to obstruct or tell this person not to testify truthfully or to falsify things.

Nothing on tort. One person, one call, five minutes that I have had this document.

So the Government is going to get up here and they are going to -- and I read the report from August 29th, which is the same report that His Honor -- Judge DiGirolamo had in front of him when this was punted. The Government is going to get up here -- I talked -- I had a chance to talk to

Mr. Ridgeway too who thinks that she needs to be held -- and they are going to ask that this woman with no criminal record be held because she has been allegedly making these phone calls they wouldn't disclose to use, the last phone call being the 3rd of September; okay? So three weeks ago.

Reasons we are are playing, you know, this sort of got you game where we are coming into the courtroom and we are doing trial by ambush, I don't know. Maybe it is because when I start calling these people they are going to disagree with

what the Government's representations are, I don't know.

But I know that we -- Mr. Gremminger and I -- just received this before you walked into the courtroom. And I make one call, talked to one witness, and it directly contradicts what the Government said that the proffer would be.

Secondly, Your Honor, the Government previously asked for a continuous on this. They asked for a continuous on the 14th of September. I am not sure -- and I get we have got to have the hearing, and I get she has got to have a lawyer, and it has to be done -- I am not sure what has changed from the 14th of September until the 21st of September when the last phone call or allegation here is on the 3rd of September, and the Pretrial allegation is the end of August.

So I am not really sure what the rush is on it. And if there is a rush -- right? If there is a rush and these are technical violations, to have her held when I was just informed by Government Counsel that they both have trials every single month from now until the beginning of next summer and that the judge who is assigned to this case is setting trial dates in July -- this is a bank fraud/wire fraud case.

We know that they have got an ongoing grand jury. They have confirmed for us that they intend to supersede before the end of the year. So we will have a superseding indictment before the end of the year. Maybe it looks more

like the complaint that they filed before they filed the indictment. I don't know because I just don't know the case well enough. Maybe that is what it looks like and maybe we are not looking at a single count of bank fraud for a \$750,000 loan that has been repaid. Maybe that there is actually something there, there.

But at his junction, I am just not quite sure what the all fire hurry is to put this woman in a cage until next summer so that they can supersede, other than they want to punish her for these alleged violations.

What I would like to do, if given by druthers, is have an opportunity to actually run some of this down, talk to some of these people, and see what is there, number one. Find out, if in fact, they can prove -- and I am sure they can with just the testimony of Agent Custer by probable cause -- that there were technical violations of the stay-away -- or the nocontact -- the no-fly list, sort to speak.

My question is -- and again, I was not involved in this case in New Mexico. There was some other lawyer Your Honor referenced that stood in as local counsel because she now lives at a ranch in New Mexico -- I don't know what the showing was. What showing was made in New Mexico that these 35 plus individuals should be on a no-contact list?

If Your Honor looks at the actual order, she is allowed to keep working. She has an ongoing concern in which

she has invested millions of her own dollars into. There are a number of investors who have been in contact with lawyers — which is actually how I got contacted on this case — to believe that what she is doing is legitimate, that there was no fraud here, they are being misrepresented, they don't want to have a no-contact with her.

So I understand that the Government can get up and they can say -- and let's just assume for the sake of today's discussion that they can easily prove these technical violations that she made phone calls to individuals that were listed on that list. I think we have an obligation -- and I am not casting these versions on the lawyers before, the judges before, or the Government in New Mexico, but we have an obligation because it is here in front of us today to actually look at it and decide do these people belong on a no-contact list? Right? Do these people belong on a no-contact list?

THE COURT: So why is that my -- why is that my job?

Why isn't it -- if I accept the Government's proffer that

Ms. Bennett may be engaging in obstruction of justice by

talking to people who are investors or whoever, and I tell

her, look, one of the conditions of release is you can't have

contact with all of these people, why is it that is solely my

call as the magistrate judge setting conditions of release?

And why do you want to have -- and why would I ever let you

have a mini hearing where we sit here for hours and hours and

talk about why Tim Sullivan wants to talk to Dawn Bennett and, you know, why -- and so I think you are putting it backwards. It is really not whether somebody on the no-contact list wants to talk to Ms. Bennett, it is Ms. Bennett's restriction on talking to them, isn't it? Isn't that the more appropriate -- MR. SCHAMEL: You are right, Your Honor. That is the appropriate analysis. The question here though and what it doesn't appear to have happened, is that analysis has ever occurred, why she was not permitted to talk to those people? Because Your Honor knows. You have tried cases as a defense lawyer 26 years. The Government doesn't just get to come in and say, no, Ms. Bennett, you can't talk to people you have known 30 and 40 years while we investigate you and prosecute you. There has to be some showing.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SCHAMEL: And there is no record here that -THE COURT: And I don't -- you know, based on what
-- the only -- and, again, Mr. Windom can -- and I don't want
to get too far ahead of all this, but, you know, I have never
seen the list, I don't -- the only thing I was able to track
was the list was presented at the Rule 5 out in the District
of New Mexico. And then Judge DiGirolamo at the initial here
adopted that list that was presented to your client, or your
limited conditional client, at the initial appearance in New
Mexico.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I have never seen the list and I don't think Judge DiGirolamo has ever seen the list. I think he just incorporated based on the Government's request that that list be incorporated into his release conditions, which is, as you know, a routine condition of release that you can't talk to witnesses, or codefendants, or people who are involved in the case to protect, really, the Defendant from allegations of obstruction, or witness tampering, or -- so it is a protection for both sides, both for the defendant, so he or she doesn't engage in conduct that could be mischaracterized by the Government as obstruction and/or witness tampering. And it also protects witnesses and victims from being harassed by somebody who has been charged with a crime. So it is kind of a two-fold thing. So I hear what you are saying. Let me --Mr. Windom, let me just ask -- go ahead. MR. SCHAMEL: May I say one last thing before I sit? THE COURT: Yes, one other thing. Go ahead. MR. SCHAMEL: I agree, Your Honor. I think your analysis is correct. Therein lies the problem, which is this -- and I am -- again, I am trying to be very careful here because I don't -- I am not even alleging anything improper by the Government; right? I mean, they have their position. They raised it.

Where the failure seems to have been is up until

this moment, right now when I am standing before Your Honor, this conversation has never occurred. Whoever this person, he or she, in New Mexico who stood in as sort of the ceremonial lawyer for that particular hearing, did not raise this issue, there was no inquiry, there was no pushback, there was no anything, so the judge just signed this mystery list of individuals.

Then it comes here and nobody raises it so -- it is not Judge DiGirolamo's job to raise that sua sponte --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SCHAMEL: -- so nobody raises it. But she is allowed to keep working and some of these people -- and I -- with restrictions understandably -- some of these people -- most of these people are people she has had relationships -- ongoing relationships for 30 plus years. And so she is under indictment. These are her closest friends. And if she -- if there are technical violations, there are technical violations. But to have conversations -- why are some of these people on the list? Particularly when the one person I have even talked to in the last -- well, now it is about 20 minutes -- said they had no interest in being on that list in the first place.

THE COURT: Yes, but it is not their call; right?

MR. SCHAMEL: No, it is not. But we need to have at least -- if the Government comes up and says she can't talk to

```
1
    Joe Blow; right? And I say, okay -- Joe Blow is an investor.
    And Joe Blow comes to me and says, I have been her best friend
3
    since we went to kindergarten together. We talk all the time.
4
    We don't want to talk about the case. We are not going to
5
    talk about the case, but we go to church together every
6
    Sunday, we have our holidays together, I sometimes stay in her
7
    house when I'm visiting. But we are not going to talk about
8
    the case. We make those concessions all the time in cases.
9
    We have family members that are co-defendants, they are
10
    allowed to talk to each other. They are not allowed to talk
11
    about the case.
12
              THE COURT: I can't help, but early on in my
13
    judicial career I actually ordered a wife not to have any
14
    communication with her husband. They were both co-defendants.
15
    And the husband said to me at a hearing, --
16
              MR. SCHAMEL: That is fine.
17
              THE COURT: -- Thank you very much.
18
              MR. SCHAMEL: (Laughter.)
19
              MR. WINDOM: (Laughter.)
20
              THE COURT: So, you know -- but I appreciate that.
21
    I mean, and I get it. I get it. But I also -- I hear you and
22
    I understand.
23
              MR. SCHAMEL:
                           Yes.
24
              THE COURT: I understand that.
25
              MR. SCHAMEL: And that is -- and obviously, I am
```

1 putting a little bit -- putting the cart before the horse and I am not trying to get out too far in front of this and say, 3 okay, everybody on that list she should be able to talk to and 4 so if she violated it doesn't matter, no harm, no foul. 5 THE COURT: Right. 6 MR. SCHAMEL: That is not the argument I am making. 7 What I am saying is there hasn't been a careful 8 analysis of the people that are on that list. If there had 9 been violations, that there have been phone calls between now 10 and the 3rd of September, I would assume that we are going to 11 see that in the superseding indictment, there are going to be 12 obstruction charges. She is going to have to live with that. 13 But the question for us is; A, am I prepared? 14 B, can I properly make the argument to Your Honor that she is 15 not a flight risk as she sits here, again, in court? And 16 having had the GPS monitoring taken off on her -- and are 17 there a condition or conditions that will assure the safety of the community from even financial harm? 18 19 THE COURT: Right. 20 MR. SCHAMEL: But I will sit here. 21 THE COURT: All right. 22 So, Mr. Windom, before you say whatever you wish to 23 say, but could you kind of follow then to your comments --24 isn't it somewhat colorable -- no pun intended on the chart

here which is all color coded -- but isn't it kind of unfair

to have these kinds of technical exhibits with numbers, and dates, and people, and not share them for whatever prosecutorial reason with counsel for Ms. Bennett, and then come in and say we are moving for detention and this is why we are moving for detention and not having allowed limited conditional defense counsel or civil lawyer who is not stuck in a very complicated criminal case, the opportunity to prepare for the hearing and, at least, you know, look at this —— look at these documents before the Government shows them to me and moves for taking away her liberty and detaining her based on that conduct and they don't have an opportunity to really review this?

MR. WINDOM: I will give you my answer and I will give you a resolution. The answer is no, it is not unfair. This happens every single day in this courthouse at regular initial detention hearings when somebody is arrested. The lawyers are brought into the case five minutes before -- not 48 hours before -- and told, okay, we are having a detention hearing. Judge Day might have it today. Judge Collier\* or yourself my set it off a few days. But they are routinely handled the same day as the defendant is arrested, presented with whatever they are presented with at the hearing. So it is not unfair.

An additional fact attenuating the situation here, last week Ms. Bennett was supposed to appear in this

```
1
    courthouse. Her lawyer at the time, Jen* Negolia* -- I
    believe was the one at the time -- told her she didn't have to
3
    come.
4
              THE COURT: Yes, I heard that. Yes. Yes.
5
              MR. WINDOM: We were going to execute -- it was
    Morvillo last week?
6
7
              THE COURT: It was Gregory Morvillo.
8
              MR. WINDOM: It was Greg Morvillo last week by
9
    phone. I am sorry. I am getting them confused as well.
10
              THE COURT:
                          That is okay. There has been so many
11
             I understand that. I can understand.
12
              MR. WINDOM: He told her she didn't have to show up.
13
    We were going to execute the warrant.
14
              MR. GREMMINGER: It wasn't me, Your Honor. I had --
15
              THE COURT: No, I know, it wasn't you.
16
              MR. GREMMINGER: Okay.
17
              MR. WINDOM: We were going to execute the search
    warrant that we executed on her today last week. The search
18
19
    warrant was to obtain the cell phones that she was using to
20
    violate the court order. The intention was always after we
21
    executed the search warrant to show the information that we
22
    have to defense counsel. It was defense counsel's choice last
23
    week to tell their client not to come to the courthouse.
24
    were unable to execute the warrant. We effected that warrant
25
    today. I immediately handed -- less than 30 seconds later --
```

the information that Defense Counsel now has and -- this in front of Your Honor -- to them.

We could not risk giving it to them beforehand because since she already has violated the court order, purchased a burner phone, made many calls on that. We believe that she would destroy evidence if her defense counsel were in possession of the information that we are using to seek detention. We could not do that beforehand.

The resolution I promised is this: They want to have time to review this? No problem. We will sign a -- if they want to sign a voluntary detention order today we can come back their election.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you this, what if I said to all of you, you know what? What is really before me today is the notice of apparent violation and let's deal with that today. And then come back tomorrow because -- you know, the cynicism that a former criminal defense attorney has to the complexity of the review process I kind of know. And I am not sure that, you know, the issue is written large here. I am not going to engage, at least at this point, in time with like going through each of these people and getting their CVs and finding out that they have some social interaction with Ms. Bennett. I am not interested in that. And that issue is -- you know, when I hear things like burner phones and things like that, obviously, that creates some interest in my mind.

24

25

1 But let me ask Mr. Schamel. 2 What do you think about the Government's proposal? 3 MR. SCHAMEL: Sign a voluntary detention order? 4 THE COURT: Uh-huh. MR. SCHAMEL: I think that I would be the worst 5 6 temporary, sort of, for the day, lawyer, in the history of 7 this courthouse probably. 8 THE COURT: Okay. So you are ready to go forward 9 today? 10 MR. SCHAMEL: No. I think, Your Honor, I have 11 articulated a number of reasons on the record why, I think, 12 that we -- I think Your Honor, frankly, is right. I don't 13 think we have the proper notice to be here for these new 14 violations. I mean, we have -- as Your Honor said when you 15 sat down, August 29th we have a violation when she was --16 THE COURT: Right. So let me just -- let me just 17 cut to the chase here. 18 MR. SCHAMEL: Sure. 19 THE COURT: What would happen just -- and I know judges aren't supposed to give advisory opinions, but this 20 21 isn't an advisory opinion. You don't know me. I don't know 22 Ms. Bennett doesn't know me. But I have a far different 23 view of release conditions than, perhaps, some of my

colleagues do. And my philosophy is pretty simple. That I

give you release conditions and we make a contract, you will

follow them and I will let you out. If you don't follow them,
I will put in detention. That is basically my philosophy.

So we go back to the allegations on August 29th with Ms. Bennett telling Pretrial that somehow she is so bewildered by what has happened to her that she can't find her way back to Chevy Chase when she is ordered to go directly home, and that the Defendant explained that she believed she was experiencing stress from the day's events and kept taking wrong turns to her home.

And Pretrial then is irritated because they told her expressly, Go right home and we will meet you there. And in -- within hours of being put on release conditions -- not getting -- forget about the no-contact -- or forget about this. I will turn this over. I won't look at this. But forget about this. Let's talk about the August 29th. Within hours of being put on release conditions she is not following her instructions.

And you know, and I know under 3148, if I make a finding that she is unable or unwilling to abide by conditions of release, then I can do other things. But, you know, why can't we just talk about the August 29th? And then I will make a decision as to whether conditions of release are appropriate, or whether she should be detained. And at that point the Government can say whatever they want about all these calls and what they view as her obstructive conduct.

25

```
1
    And we can set this in for another hearing tomorrow or -- what
    is today? Today is Wednesday?
3
              MR. WINDOM:
                          Thursday.
4
              THE COURT:
                          Thursday. And we can set it in for
5
    another hearing tomorrow after you have had an opportunity to
6
    -- and you are with a big firm; right? You are with -- or who
7
    are you with? Womble?
8
              MR. SCHAMEL: Womble Carlyle.
9
              THE COURT: Yes. They got tons of lawyers so you
10
    can like work this thing up overnight and just --
11
              MR. SCHAMEL: (Laugher.)
12
              THE COURT: -- and with all your associates and
13
    everything else and be fully ready with your defense team
14
    tomorrow and enter your full appearance to represent her and
15
    we don't have to worry about this conditional limited
16
    representation.
17
              So why don't we move forward with the hearing today?
18
    Well, we are going to move forward with the hearing today,
19
    talking primarily about the notice of apparent violation on
20
    the 29th. And if the Government believes that they want to
21
    bring additional information to my attention, we will -- I
22
    will listen to that as well.
23
              But we are not going to -- everybody is on notice at
24
    least minimally that we are here for the August 29th memo,
```

which Pretrial says within hours Ms. Bennett's supervision is

```
1
    poor and they want a prompt bail review hearing.
2
              And Mr. Ridgeway is here. And I am going to hear
3
    from him about what is going on and how supervision has been.
4
    And I think that is a more logical way to approach this.
5
              MR. SCHAMEL: I think that is completely fine, Your
6
    Honor.
7
              THE COURT: Okay.
8
              MR. SCHAMEL: That makes a lot of sense. And I
9
    think -- may I address the question you proffered to me about
10
    -- I think you asked me sort of -- or maybe it was rhetorical
11
    -- about so this is the way you see things and this is the how
12
    you do. And candidly I wish you had been the judge at the
13
    first hearing and I had been the lawyer at the first hearing
    and there wouldn't be a need for this hearing because --
14
15
              THE COURT: Be careful what you ask for.
16
              MR. SCHAMEL: No, actually I get a sense, Your
17
    Honor, that you and I are sort of the same ilk on these
18
    things. I don't play in the grey on these.
19
              THE COURT: Right.
20
              MR. SCHAMEL: You know, my view is if we are in
21
    court and we are making excuses for why I did something, we
22
    have already done something wrong.
23
              THE COURT:
                         Okay.
24
              MR. SCHAMEL: So I hear you on the 29th. I mean, I
25
    am -- I used some colorful language that my mother is not very
```

proud of when I talk to my clients about what the rules are, what they have to do when we follow court. And I think Your Honor would have been probably -- and I don't have the benefit of having heard the court reporter's version of what happened last time, but it would have been pretty clear and I think I would have been equally clear.

By the same token though, I mean -- and this is why
I think it is important what I am saying, she didn't come to
the last court appearance. A lawyer -- whichever lawyer it
was --

THE COURT: Yes, let me just put -- let me just -- MR. SCHAMEL: Right.

THE COURT: I listened to that. It is incredible risk for an attorney to make a decision to tell his or her client not to come to a court appearance. Judge DiGirolamo handled it the way Judge DiGirolamo chose to handle it.

Would I have been as accommodating? No. But that is water under the bridge. And, you know -- but it is a fair argument that whether she didn't come because the lawyer told her not to come or she didn't come because she didn't feel like she wanted to be bothered with coming -- I mean, those are -- that is a fair inference that both parties can argue. But I am not going to hold -- you know, there is -- I am not going to put any weight at all into Ms. Bennett's not being physically present at the September 14th hearing before Judge

```
1
    DiGirolamo. That has got no weight. I am not considering.
    It has been raised, but I am not considering that in any way.
3
              MR. SCHAMEL: I didn't suggest you were, Your Honor.
4
              THE COURT: Right.
5
              MR. SCHAMEL: The reason I was bringing it up was
    context because I think we have to -- again, context is
6
7
    important. And this is why the Procedural Rules say, when
8
    possible, the judge who issued the order is supposed to be the
9
    judge who does the hearing.
10
              THE COURT: I am not sure it says that. I am not
11
    sure it says that. It says if there is a commission of a new
12
    crime; right?
13
              MR. SCHAMEL: I will have to look back at 3148,
14
    but --
15
              THE COURT: Well, go ahead. Go ahead. But let me
16
    put it this say, let's nip this in the bud too, I got a
17
    referral -- I got a --
18
              MR. SCHAMEL: I have no problem with Your Honor
19
    doing it. I am not raising that as a --
20
              THE COURT: No. No. I mean, we are not going back
21
    to Judge DiGirolamo and --
22
              MR. SCHAMEL: And I am not suggesting that we were.
23
              THE COURT: And he set it in for me and I now have
24
    the referral from Judge Xinis on the attorney inquiry --
25
              MR. SCHAMEL: Correct.
```

1 THE COURT: -- which is a broad spectrum medication. 2 And, you know, you and I -- if you are no longer the limited 3 conditional attorney, you know, you are going to be 4 inextricably intertwined with me as we move through all these 5 preliminary things. 6 So it is not going -- I hear what you are saying. 7 It is not going back to Judge DiGirolamo. It is, you know --8 MR. SCHAMEL: And I wasn't asking for that, Your 9 I am just saying, we are -- you and I are both coming Honor. 10 at this with fresh eyes not having been there. 11 THE COURT: Sure. Right. 12 MR. SCHAMEL: And the manner -- and I will say this 13 -- I am always reluctant on the record to say things that 14 sounds like I am throwing someone under the bus -- but the 15 loosey goosey manner in which representations were made on 16 Ms. Bennett's behalf prior to today, make me inherently 17 uncomfortable. The fact that any lawyer would tell their 18 client in any circumstance in a criminal case not to come to 19 court is completely beyond the realm of understanding. I do 20 not have any idea why anybody would say that. 21 When I tell my clients to come to court they come an 22 hour early. We checked in with Your Honor's courtroom deputy, 23 Reggie, at ten minutes after one as soon as your -- whatever 24 time Your Honor got off the bench from your prior hearing. We 25 are here early. We are here promptly always, unless I have

something in writing saying otherwise.

So what I am trying to -- the point I am trying to make is, when an order is issued to my client to go directly home, before we walk out of the courtroom I turn to my client and say, Do you have to pick up your kids? Do you have gas in your car -- to stop for gas? And then if they have to and say, Look, I got no gas, or I didn't get ride here, I have to wait to get picked up, I go back on the record and I put it on the record in front of the court and say, Your Honor, my client can't go directly home. She has to pick up her child.

I am not saying Ms. Bennett has a child, but -- and take those kinds of precautions to avoid exactly this kind of problem. And what I am trying to ask Your Honor is to put yourself in the situation of we don't know what those conversations were and we don't know that she was given that sort of scared straight talk that Your Honor has already started giving that I have been giving for the 48 hours I have known Ms. Bennett.

So I just -- I want, contextually, Your Honor to understand it is -- it sounds so cheesy to say it -- we have a new sheriff. This is a new situation. I don't practice the way it appears that they have practiced over the last couple of weeks.

THE COURT: Right. But what if I never see you again? I mean, I will probably cry, but what if I never see

```
1
    you again? I mean, what if your conditional limited position
    in the court, and all of how you practice law, and, you know
3
    -- I know who you are and you have a great reputation. But,
4
    you know, what if I never see you again? And -- because you
5
    couldn't work out with Ms. Bennett the logistics of your
    representation as counsel of choice? And then you disappear.
6
7
    And then, Hi, Mr. Gremminger.
8
              MR. SCHAMEL: (Laughter.)
9
              THE COURT: So, you know, what are we -- I hear what
10
    you are saying. Let me just let Mr. Windom say something.
11
              MR. SCHAMEL: Yes, Your Honor.
12
              THE COURT: But let me just say just to answer again
13
    to kind of tamp down some things if we can. My reading of
    3148 says this, "To the extent practicable, a person charged
14
15
    with violating the condition of release that such person no
16
    commit a Federal, State, or local crime during the period of
17
    release, shall be brought before the judicial officer who
18
    ordered the release and whose order is alleged to have been
19
    violated."
20
              So the culture in this court also is that, you know,
21
    whoever pulls duty and gets it, gets it. And that is why I
22
    got it. So, you know --
23
              MR. WINDOM: I can speak on that, actually, please.
24
              When we -- when the parties mutually requested that
25
    the detention hearing be pushed, the parties talked about what
```

dates worked for them. One of them was in New York. I can't just walk into the courthouse on any given day.

That defense counsel and Government counsel were available today, as it turns out. When we called chambers and said, Hey -- Judge DiGirolamo's chambers -- and said, Hey, let's set it in. They said, Sure, not a problem. Oh, Judge Sullivan is on the bench that day. It works for you all, but Judge Sullivan is going to be hearing it.

So that is -- as a practical matter, why we are here today before you. There is absolutely no legal bar to have any judicial officer in this district hearing this.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SCHAMEL: Agreed. And I was trying to make a representation -- if I did it awkwardly and unartfully, let me clear up the record for Your Honor. I am not suggesting that Your Honor is not judicially appropriate to hear this. I am not suggesting in any way that it shouldn't be before Your Honor or I am not asking Your Honor to send it back to Judge DiGirolamo.

What I am suggesting is you weren't here, I wasn't here. So I am always reluctant to go too far down the pike of how it should have been assuming that we did it the right way.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SCHAMEL: And given the fact that this young woman was told not to come back to court, and her lawyer has

```
1
    confirmed that, that tells me it is a sort of loosey goosey --
2
              THE COURT: Right.
3
              MR. SCHAMEL: -- attitude that is not really in line
4
    with the way it should be handled.
5
              THE COURT: All right. I understand. All right.
6
              So, Ridgeway --
7
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes.
8
              THE COURT: -- let me -- let's start talking about
9
    the -- and I understand what everybody is says and I will take
10
    into consideration as how we proceed.
11
              But, Mr. Ridgeway, good afternoon.
12
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Good afternoon.
13
              THE COURT: So I have read -- and, I guess,
14
    Mr. Windom, you have -- and Ms. Pulice have reviewed the
15
    August 29th memo; correct?
16
              Mr. Windom? Hello?
17
              MR. WINDOM: Yes, sir. I am sorry.
18
              THE COURT: Okay. And you have reviewed the August
19
    29th memo?
20
              MR. WINDOM: yes.
21
              THE COURT: All right. And, counsel, both of you
22
    have reviewed the memo as well?
23
              MR. SCHAMEL: Mr. Ridgeway was kind enough to give
24
    me one today and I have had a chance review it.
25
              THE COURT: Right. Okay. All right.
```

MR. SCHAMEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Ridgeway, why don't you tell me

 $\mid$  -- I mean, I read what you say happened hours after her placed

4 -- being placed on conditions of release from

5 Judge DiGirolamo. So why don't you tell me whatever it is

6 that you want to tell me. And include in your comments to me

how conditions of release are progressing since she has been

8 placed on release conditions, and including as how they have

9 been modified.

MR. RIDGEWAY: Okay. Your Honor, first of all I want preface this by saying that at the August 28th initial appearance before Judge DiGirolamo I wasn't there for that hearing. But our office did make -- upon hearing the additional --- by the Government, we did make a recommendation to be detention in this case based on flight and danger in this case.

So we are coming from that position as -- and then Judge DiGirolamo ordered Ms. Bennett released on the very strict conditions to include location monitoring.

As Your Honor knows, you know, when someone is placed on location monitoring, it is the most restrictive form of supervision that we provide the court. And it is expected that that defendant abide by all those conditions. And the instructions are from our office.

As noted in my report here, you know, there -- it

```
1
    didn't happen that way. Ms. Bennett, she was instructed to go
    back home. I --
3
              THE COURT: Did you instruct her or did somebody
4
    else?
5
              MR. RIDGEWAY: I did.
6
              THE COURT: Okay.
7
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes, I met -- yes, I -- so I wasn't
    here for the hearing, but I was -- I --
8
9
              THE COURT: Right. So they had the regular --
10
    somebody else, whoever covers the writers were here then.
11
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Correct.
12
              THE COURT: She went down to Pretrial and got
13
    assigned to you as electronic supervisor or whatever it is.
14
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes, Your Honor. Yes. So we went
15
    through the whole thing and I made very clear to her -- gave
16
    it to her in verbal instructions and written instructions
17
    letting her know that she needs to go straight back home, make
18
    no additional stops. And I was going to meet her back at her
19
    residence to install her on location monitoring equipment.
20
              I got -- she left our courthouse around three
21
    o'clock. And, you know, I got to the -- her residence -- I
22
    left -- you know, I stuck around the office for a while. And
23
    still got there at, I think, around four o'clock, Your Honor.
24
              But as my report here indicates, she didn't call me
25
    until -- and let me know that she was actually at the
```

Case 8:17-cr-00472-PX Document 191 Filed 04/03/18 Page 40 of 88 nm 1 residence until 5:13 p.m. So --THE COURT: So --3 MR. RIDGEWAY: So we are talking about over two 4 hours to get back home. 5 THE COURT: So where -- just so the record reflects, 6 where was -- she was supposed to go straight home from the 7 Greenbelt courthouse to where is straight home? Where was 8 that? 9 MR. RIDGEWAY: In Chevy Chase, Maryland. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. RIDGEWAY: So from here to the courthouse. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 MR. RIDGEWAY: So --14 THE COURT: So the beltway to Connecticut Avenue or 15 the beltway to Wisconsin or wherever Chevy Chase --16 MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes. Correct. 17 THE COURT: Wherever -- okay. 18 MR. RIDGEWAY: And I didn't have much difficulty getting there on that date. There wasn't any excessive 19 20 traffic getting to the location. 21 It wasn't about that. As I note here in this

report, according to Ms. Bennett she says that she got -- kept on getting lost. She kept on taking wrong turns in getting to the residence.

25 But I will note that --

22

23

24

```
1
              THE COURT: So from Greenbelt to Chevy Chase, where
    she lives, she told you that she was making wrong turns.
3
    is why she wasn't there when she was supposed to be there?
4
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Correct. Yes.
5
              THE COURT: Okav.
6
              MR. RIDGEWAY: But, you know, I think the other
7
    thing that is important to note is that during this time --
8
    because I arrived there well before she did -- I had left
9
    before she got there because I -- at that point I hadn't had
10
    with her. When I first got to her residence I only met with
11
    her assistant after finally getting into the residence.
12
    a gated residence. But after I finally spoke with the
13
    assistant he tried to make contact with her. I had also made
14
    contact with her attorney to what her attorney noted that she
15
    wasn't here.
16
              THE COURT:
                         Which attorney?
17
              MR. RIDGEWAY: I --
18
              THE COURT:
                         Him? Mr. -- okay.
19
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes. I believe so.
20
              THE COURT:
                         All right.
21
              MR. RIDGEWAY: And so I let him know that, you know,
22
    there was an issue. I mean, at this point, Your Honor, as you
23
    probably can grasp, that I was probably thinking that
24
    Ms. Bennett had, you know, absconded at that point.
25
              So I left the residence with the mind that I was
```

25

```
1
    going to be coming back to the office to draft a request for a
    warrant. On the way back to the office she finally called me.
3
    And, again, Your Honor, if I haven't said so already, I was
4
    making -- you know, I had been making calls to her, I made the
    call to her attorney. She finally calls me back and it wasn't
5
6
    until, as the report indicates -- at 5:13 is when she actually
7
    got back into the residence. And then I did ultimately go
8
    back to the residence and ultimately installed her on the
9
    location monitoring equipment that day.
10
              Your Honor, that is not the way it is supposed to
11
    happen at all. And I find it difficult to believe that
12
    Ms. Bennett wasn't able to answer my calls. You know, if --
13
    again, I know she indicates that she was getting lost, went
14
    the wrong way on the beltway, but why she also didn't respond
15
    to my calls -- my numerous calls to her cell phone is another
16
    question I have. I don't think was answered.
17
                         So approximately about how many calls
              THE COURT:
18
    did you make to her that she didn't pick up on, if you recall?
19
    Did you keep a log of that? Or just if you can estimate for
20
    me.
21
              MR. RIDGEWAY: It was a number. It was several.
22
              MR. WINDOM: I can tell you that, Your Honor. Five.
23
              THE COURT: Oh, because it is on this list? Or some
24
    other list?
```

MR. WINDOM: It is not on that list.

```
1
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. So five calls.
                                                              All
    right.
2
3
              MR. SCHAMEL: They have got a lot of lists, Judge.
4
              MR. RIDGEWAY: So, again, Your Honor, you know, we
5
    -- you know, our office would have preferred for this hearing
    to have happened rapidly after -- you know, we -- it just
6
7
    didn't happen that way. We did not get back before the Court
8
    for this hearing -- for the bail review hearing on this
9
    violation. And, you know, for all the different reasons that
10
    have kind have been -- gone through in the court today.
11
              Since --
12
              THE COURT: So what happened with -- again, just
13
    because we are -- I am trying to recreate the circumstances
14
    here. So was she placed on EM that night or --
15
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes.
16
              THE COURT: Okay.
17
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes, she was.
18
              THE COURT: All right.
19
              MR. RIDGEWAY: And so -- and since that date, you
20
    know, as far complying with location monitoring, there has not
21
    been any issues. She has --
22
              THE COURT: Well, what was the modification that
23
    Judge DiGirolamo made rather informally? What was that?
24
    Would that modification affect the electronic monitoring or
25
    something else?
```

```
1
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Your Honor, that was due only because
    our -- we were -- after numerous attempts -- I made numerous
3
    visits to her residence to attempt to fix the -- we were
4
    having issues with location monitoring equipment itself.
5
              THE COURT: Right. And that is what I am trying to
6
             What were those issues?
7
              MR. RIDGEWAY: We could not get a good signal in the
8
    residence. I don't -- I am not entirely sure if it was
9
    because of the concrete walls in the -- her condo. You know,
10
    it is a -- I have only had his happen one other time when I
11
    could not get our equipment to function properly. But it
12
    would not function properly in her residence.
13
              So we ultimately had to switch her over to the voice
14
    ID system.
15
              THE COURT: But why isn't -- could a cell unit work?
16
              MR. RIDGEWAY: No, Your Honor. Same -- I actually
17
    went from a land-line unit to a cell unit. Or actually, vice-
18
    versa. From a cell until to a land-line unit. We actually
    tried some -- another unit that was supposedly going to give
19
20
    us more range. None of those units functioned properly --
21
              THE COURT:
                         Okay.
22
              MR. RIDGEWAY: -- in that residence.
23
              THE COURT: So when Judge DiGirolamo modified it to
24
    voice recognition were you out of supervision at that point
25
    and got transferred to someone else or did you --
```

```
1
              MR. RIDGEWAY: No, I still retained this case.
2
              THE COURT: Oh, you stayed? Okay.
3
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes.
4
              THE COURT: So what has been going on since then?
5
              MR. RIDGEWAY: She has been compliant with all my
6
    instructions as far as reporting in and the location
7
    monitoring parts.
8
              Your Honor, I think the other information is going
9
    to come from the Government.
10
              THE COURT: Right.
11
              MR. RIDGEWAY: But, again, our office's
12
    recommendation hasn't changed since the initial appearance,
13
    which is detention in this case.
14
              THE COURT: So what do you have her on exactly right
15
    now? What do you mean -- for the record, what does voice
16
    recognition mean?
17
              MR. RIDGEWAY: So she gets calls randomly throughout
18
    the day and she has to be there present to answer these calls,
19
    she has to speak into the phone and repeat a series of numbers
20
    that will verify it is her voice.
21
              THE COURT: So it is the same thing we use for
22
    curfew?
23
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Correct.
24
              THE COURT: The voice recognition for curfew? It is
25
    the same the thing?
```

Case 8:17-cr-00472-PX Document 191 Filed 04/03/18 Page 46 of 88 nm 1 MR. RIDGEWAY: Same thing. Same thing. 2 THE COURT: Okay. MR. WINDOM: Is she on it completely right now? 3 4 MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes. MR. WINDOM: And it is only voice recognition during 5 6 the time ---, correct? 7 MR. RIDGEWAY: Right, 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. MR. SCHAMEL: I am sorry, I just couldn't get the 8 9 Government's questions on the record. 10 THE COURT: Yes, I don't think they probably wanted 11 you to hear, but go -- what --12 MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes. She --13 MR. WINDOM: I will speak. My understand was there 14 was curfew -- voice Ident during curfew. Not all day. 15 THE COURT: Oh, okay. All right. 16 MR. RIDGEWAY: Correct. 17 THE COURT: All right. Okay. 18 MR. WINDOM: And, Mr. Ridgeway, did -- before you 19 step back, did Ms. Bennett tell you anything on August 28th 20 about where exactly she had been after she left the 21 courthouse?

22 MR. RIDGEWAY: Where she had been after the 23 courthouse?

24 MR. WINDOM: Yes.

25 MR. RIDGEWAY: Again, as I recall, she went -- she

```
1
    said she went the wrong way on the beltway. And that was
    about it. We didn't talk much about where she had been, I
3
    don't believe. I mean, I will check my notes here though.
4
              MR. WINDOM: No, that is what I was referring to.
5
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Okay.
6
              MR. WINDOM: That she had said she went the wrong
7
    way on the beltway.
8
              THE COURT: Right. And I just noticed this too, the
9
    Defendant stated her phone was broken and later added that she
10
    had silenced her phone. So did you make any inquiry as to her
11
    phone at all? But she did call you, so why was her phone
12
    broken?
13
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes. Your Honor, --
14
              THE COURT: If she called you --
15
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Correct, Your Honor. And I think --
16
    you know, I think the Government has some other information.
17
    But the screen was cracked. I did inquire about her phone. I
18
    did see that it was cracked. But, again, she was using her
19
    phone and she has been using her phone.
20
              THE COURT:
                        Right.
21
              MR. RIDGEWAY: So --
22
              THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, do you have any kind of
23
    informal questions for Mr. Ridgeway? One or two questions
24
    that you want to follow up on?
25
              MR. SCHAMEL: I think if, if I heard him correctly,
```

```
1
    he said since the day of the 29th, there has been complete
    compliance with everything he has asked of her.
3
              He didn't -- there was a -- I am aware -- and maybe
4
    I am wrong about this -- if there was a particular incident
5
    like there was a fire alarm one night and she left so she
6
    called in to make sure she was calling in property. And he
7
    was happy with that.
8
              But my understanding since this initial court
9
    appearance that I would like to talk about in a minute, Your
10
    Honor, there hasn't been any complaints by Pretrial.
11
    little troubled, candidly, by the fact that they haven't
12
    changed their view about her flight risk even though she keeps
13
    coming to court.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, don't worry about that.
15
    But, Mr. Ridgeway, based on his question to you -- Counsel's
16
    question to you, has she been compliant since this time?
17
    did she call to say she had to leave the building because of a
18
    fire alarm or something like that?
19
              MR. RIDGEWAY: Your Honor, there have been no
20
    location monitoring violations to my knowledge.
21
              THE COURT: Okay. Okay. All right.
22
              Mr. Windom?
23
              MR. WINDOM:
                           Thank you, Your Honor.
24
              So where was she and what was she doing?
25
              MR. WINDOM: Well, I think -- let me just see -- I
```

```
1
    got -- short circuit this because, not unnecessarily, but no
    one will ever convince me that she was experiencing stress
3
    from the days' event and kept taking wrong turns to return
4
    home. So I -- you can conclude that I don't believe that.
5
    go ahead.
6
              MR. WINDOM: I am going to hand up one other exhibit
7
    that had not intended to use. I just handed it to Defense
8
    Counsel.
              Your Honor, at the time of the initial appearance on
10
    August 28th, the Government had a pin up on Ms. Bennett's
11
    phone. It wasn't -- it didn't give us GPS location, but it
12
    did give us cell towers.
13
              We have her -- on this exhibit -- and I will just
    put it up here on the screen. Consistent with parts of what
14
15
    she told Pretrial at the very top, this location. She left
16
    the courthouse. She did go in the opposite direction on the
17
    beltway.
18
              Just for the record, Your Honor, it is at most a 25
19
    minute drive from here to Ms. Bennett's home.
20
              THE COURT: Where in Chevy Chase does she live?
21
              MR. WINDOM: She lives right on the D.C. border.
22
    She lives about --
23
              THE COURT: So Friendship Heights?
24
              MR. WINDOM: -- two, three blocks north of the D.C.
25
    border on Wisconsin.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: So basically by Mazza, Friendship
2
    Heights.
             Somewhere around there?
              MR. WINDOM: Across from -- there is a Tiffany's and
3
4
    all these fancy stores on the east side of the road. She is
    in a building on the west side of the road about a block past
5
6
    the Starbucks there in Friendship Heights.
7
              THE COURT: Okay. All right.
8
              MR. WINDOM: Two blocks from the Starbucks.
9
              So she goes in the other direction on the beltway
10
    around. And then she comes up -- she goes around east side of
11
    the beltway, appears to come through the city, and then up
12
    through -- up on 34th. Up on Rock Creek. And most likely,
13
    based on the fact that she was at Wisconsin and MaComb, she
14
    probably took 34th Arena up through the city.
15
              And then she is basically at home, near her home,
16
    for an hour. A solid hour before making contact with
17
    Pretrial. So she didn't just get lost. She wasn't making
18
    wrong turns. She was physically in the vicinity of her home.
19
    And we know it wasn't just, oh, the cell phone somehow is over
20
    there and she is somewhere else because she is using it.
21
              The bottom part of this is who she is calling. You
22
    can ignore the 1506 subscriber information. That was an
23
    earlier -- that was an earlier subscriber. There is a
24
    different subscriber than that individual there.
25
              She left the courthouse. She made a call. She then
```

```
1
    called her lawyer for 41 minutes. Spoke to Mr. McNeal*, who
    is an employee of hers. Spoke to Mr. Fuentes, whose name
3
    appears in the Pretrial report, at 4:02 p.m. -- being
4
    completely consist with what Mr. Ridgeway said and Mr. Fuentes
5
    said, that Ms. Bennett had called Mr. Fuentes at 4:02.
6
    then she gets on the phone again with somebody from work and
7
    she doesn't pick up the call from Pretrial. She just doesn't
8
    pick it up.
9
              The phone wasn't silenced, the phone wasn't broken.
10
    She just ignored it twice, 4:14 p.m., 4:17 p.m.
11
              Then she just continued apace making phone calls.
12
    She called Mr. McNeal again. She called Mr. McNeal again.
13
              THE COURT: Is Mr. McNeal the person or the
14
    assistant that Mr. Ridgeway -- or is that somebody else?
15
              MR. WINDOM: Mr. Fuentes is.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. Okay.
17
              MR. WINDOM: Mr. McNeal is an employee.
18
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
19
              MR. WINDOM: His principle office is just on the --
20
    it is actually at Chevy Chase Pavilion where that Cheesecake
21
    Factory and all that stuff is.
22
              THE COURT: Okay. Sure.
23
              MR. WINDOM: Just --
24
              THE COURT: By Western. I know where it is.
25
              MR. WINDOM: Yes, exactly. Western and Wisconsin.
```

THE COURT: Right.

MR. WINDOM: So she just ignores the calls. And then she is on the phone with McNeal. And then she just ignores two other phone calls.

Takes a call from Mr. Gremminger -- which I assume, given the timing of what Mr. Ridgeway says in his report,
Mr. Gremminger called his client right after Mr. Ridgeway called Mr. Gremminger and said, Hey, where is your client?

So she picks up the phone for Mr. Gremminger.

Appears that it could be a longer voicemail. And then

ultimately she does call Pretrial, consistent with what

Mr. Ridgeway said, after five o'clock.

So you want context. What was she doing? Why was she doing it? Why did she not go straight home? Well, we submit that the evidence in the other charts that we provided to you is that she was intent to find a way around the court's no-contact order. And she spent that time procuring another phone. She spent that time procuring a burner phone. That is the inference from all of the information that we have.

I will put up here, Your Honor -- that is the purpose of her evasion of Pretrial, the sheer purpose. So the chart that we presented -- and we don't need to go past, really that day, other than as context for why she did it, but we start off at the top on August 25th. She, Ms. Bennett, has the detention hearing in New Mexico where she is not

```
1
    represented by some stand-in flunky in New Mexico. She is
    represented by Jen Negolia on the phone from New York.
3
    there was a problem with any of the conditions of release they
4
    would be noticed.
5
              So she walks out of New Mexico -- I think she got a
6
    ride home from the agent because she had to -- or Pretrial
7
    because she had to surrender her passport which was at her
8
    residence.
9
              And she then immediately violates the release order
10
    that she just signed. Immediately. That is 9:45 p.m.
11
    eastern, 6:45 -- 7:45 in New Mexico? 7:45 in New Mexico.
12
    has just gotten home and she violates right away using her own
13
    phone.
14
              So she violates with Ms. Pesner*, again with
15
    Ms. Pesner.
16
              Mr. Collins is an interesting case --
17
              THE COURT: So let me just understand something,
18
    Mr. Windom.
19
              MR. WINDOM: Yes.
20
              MR. SCHAMEL: So Pesner -- just in that section that
21
    we are talking about right now -- Pesner, Collins, and
22
    Johnston -- are all of them on the no-contact list that the
23
    magistrate judge in New Mexico ordered no contact with as a
24
    condition of release?
```

25 MR. WINDOM: Every single person on this list.

25

```
1
              THE COURT: Okay.
2
              MR. WINDOM: And there are two sections of the no-
3
    contact order. One is no contact, period. One is no contact,
4
    essentially, about the case. These people are all in the no-
5
    contact, no contact, period, list.
              So she violates. She violates. She violates.
6
                                                              She,
7
    on the 26th -- there is an interesting way of violating, which
8
    apparently doesn't show up on the toll records, Facetime.
9
    Because you go through Apple's proprietary technology. So she
10
    has an extensive Facetime conversation with one of the people
11
    that she was prohibited from contacting.
12
              She then flies --
13
              MR. SCHAMEL: I am sorry. Is that -- I just want to
14
    inquire with Government Counsel -- is that on here? I am just
15
    not seeing it.
16
              MR. WINDOM: Yes. Facetime. Type, Column B, Row 5,
17
    6, 7.
18
              MR. SCHAMEL: All right. Just -- may I approach,
19
    Your Honor?
20
              THE COURT: Yes, sure. Yes.
21
              MR. SCHAMEL: I am just trying to follow on here.
22
             Okay. Got you.
    Show me.
23
              THE COURT: So if you look at column A, then there
24
    is column B that says, "Type."
```

MR. SCHAMEL: Yes. I got it now. Thank you, Your

25

1 Honor. 2 THE COURT: And then it says, "Facetime." Right. MR. SCHAMEL: I was looking for a different section. 3 4 I didn't catch A and B. Thank you, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Sure. Okay. That is fine. No problem. 6 MR. WINDOM: She flies back east. And she gets in 7 contact with her personal assistant, Mr. Fuentes. And for 8 whatever reason -- but of course, the logical assumption is 9 that she knows she shouldn't be talking to people -- she gets 10 Mr. Fuentes' phone. And that is the yellow highlighting. And 11 she calls Mr. Collins using Mr. Fuentes' phone. Outgoing call 12 from Mr. Fuentes' phone and then Mr. Collins calls back. 13 THE COURT: So let me -- and then if you choose not 14 to answer, you do so, that is fine. What evidence does the 15 Government have that that call from Mr. Fuentes, the 8588 16 number, to Mr. Collins wasn't in fact Mr. Fuentes, but was 17 Ms. Bennett? Why isn't it just as logical that Fuentes called 18 Collins? 19 MR. WINDOM: We understand that Mr. Fuentes picked 20 up Ms. Bennett from the airport when she arrived on the east 21 coast and I -- without going into massive detail -- we had 22 spoken with Mr. Collins. 23 THE COURT: Okay. All right go ahead. 24 MR. WINDOM: So then she resorts to using her own

phone again. This is Saturday, by the way, August 26.

```
1
    uses her phone to attempt a Facetime call with Mr. Collins.
    And then receives a text message from Mr. Johnston on the --
3
    morning of the 28th, which is when she appears here in court.
4
    She was scheduled for an 11 a.m. hearing. So she receives a
5
    text message from Mr. Johnston about three hours before she
    comes here.
6
7
              Then she has her hearing downstairs in 1A with Judge
8
    DiGirolamo. She is released on conditions including location
9
    monitoring.
10
              And here is where it gets interesting. The orange
11
    phone is Steve Gremminger's phone. That phone call --
12
              THE COURT: So the 4162 is her attorney's call --
13
    phone number?
14
              MR. WINDOM: The --
15
              MR. SCHAMEL: Were you on line 13?
16
              MR. WINDOM: Yes. Line 13 is Mr. --
17
              THE COURT: Okay. I got you.
18
              MR. WINDOM: And he can confirm or deny, but that is
19
    our understanding.
20
              THE COURT: Okay.
21
              MR. WINDOM: But that is his phone. Interesting
22
    part about this is she is supposed to be in the courthouse.
23
    It is 1:42 p.m. I randomly had a two p.m. hearing downstairs
24
    in 1A. I was sitting outside on the bench having some potato
25
    chips at 1:50. This call lasted six minutes.
```

I saw Ms. Bennett in the lobby with her counsel two minutes after this call concluded. She was in the courthouse when she borrowed her lawyers phone to violate the order that Judge DiGirolamo had just placed on her. Again, advancing the understanding that she knew she shouldn't be getting in touch with these people.

Another reason we know that she knew that is because she told Mr. Collins on this phone call, I shouldn't be talking to you. So then she leaves.

Then we get to the Pretrial part. Three p.m. she left the courthouse. We have already put up the pin information, but essentially she is in the vicinity of her office for an hour. And then she meets up with Pretrial around 5:13.

The logical inference from the information that we have is that she used that time to buy a burner phone, which we put up there -- to either buy or acquire from somebody else. Perhaps Mr. Johnston. Perhaps some other source.

We put up there the tracfone subscriber information for this particular cell phone number. This phone was activated on the same day, August 28th. Right here. And the way -- and my understanding of the way tracfones work is you buy the phone and you buy the plan. So you can buy a tracfone phone, but you can also buy a tracfone card as well, to populate the minutes. And this was a pay as you go plan.

```
1
              So the card was activated at 7:23 p.m. Two hours
    later the card is activated the same day that she is ordered
3
    to report home. So the logical inference of all of this is
4
    that she knew that she wasn't able to talk to these folks, she
5
    knew that her phone was hot, and she went to go get another
    phone. And then she activated it from her residence where she
6
7
    was on location monitoring at that time.
8
              And she didn't take a slow start to this. There
9
    wasn't a slow approach. She immediately got on the phone with
    -- let's see the number -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
10
11
    people on the no-contact list --
12
              THE COURT: Can I just ask you a question? I don't
13
    mean to interrupt your train of thought.
14
              MR. WINDOM: Yes.
15
              THE COURT: But I am trying to -- the phone that the
16
    Government seized a little while ago pursuant to a warrant
17
    that -- I didn't do it so I guess another magistrate judge did
18
    it -- was that the burner phone? I will just use it as a
19
    broad -- I will just use that colloquially -- a burner -- was
20
    that the burner or was that her other 202 number?
21
              MR. WINDOM: It was the cracked iPhone. It was not
22
    what we are calling the burner phone.
23
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
24
              MR. WINDOM: So she --
25
              THE COURT: You mean the iPhone that wasn't working
```

25

```
1
    but the record shows that she was using it?
2
              MR. WINDOM: Yes. Which works.
3
              THE COURT: That one. Yes. Okay.
4
              MR. WINDOM: Which I saw the screen on. It is
    cracked in the bottom left hand corner.
5
6
              THE COURT: Right. All right. Go ahead.
7
    you.
8
              MR. WINDOM: So she gets right to it. I mean, she
9
    gets right to it. And she calls any number of witnesses that
10
    she knows that she is not to have any contact with in any way.
11
    These folks, the Government contends are victims in this case.
12
    They are investors fraudulently induced to provide funds to
13
    Ms. Bennett, Janice Raji*, Susan Pesner again, Mr. Collins.
14
              There is another phone number on there that is the
15
    same city of Ben Collins. It appears as the same street or
    nearby where he lives, but we just put "City" then "Collins"
16
17
    because we didn't have the subscriber info for that phone for
18
    him.
19
              Then Collins again, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Johnston,
20
    Mr. Eickelston*. Calls, texts, you name it.
21
              This is why she did not go straight home, so that
22
    she could acquire a phone. These records only go through
23
    September 3rd. She is burning through her minutes. There is
24
    three pages. There is 130 separate violations. And I -- you
```

know, there is only so many times you can hear the word

technical about a violation before you have to say something about it.

These aren't technical violations. The entire reason these people are on this list is because they are going to be witnesses in this trial. She has clearly had substantial sway over them for a number of years to induce them to provide funds as part of this fraud scheme. She is not -- she was using her iPhones in order to --

THE COURT: Let me interrupt. I mean, I don't know why I ask people if I can interrupt because I can interrupt anytime I want.

MR. WINDOM: I will stop whenever you tell me.

know what he is going to get up and say because he has already said it in his limited conditional appearance. He is going to say, Judge, the affidavit and the conduct alleged by this Defendant in the affidavit is not remotely the same as the indictment that was returned by the grand jury. In the indictment returned by the grand jury we have \$750,000 line of credit or loan from Eagle Bank that was maybe misused or lied about in the process. She said it was allegedly for capital. And then the grand jury has been able to show that, you know, her definition of capital is, you know, lifestyle of the rich and famous, and not anything to do with working capital in the traditional sense.

```
1
              So don't you think at some point, Mr. Windom -- I
    doubt if want to agree with this, but I have just got to ask
3
    you -- that what should I make of the fact that what she is
4
    actually -- I guess the criminal complaint is still out there
5
    somewhere. I mean, that is still a live case, or did it get
    merged into this indictment, or --
6
7
              MR. WINDOM: My understanding of that process, Your
8
    Honor, is that the indictment takes over the case. Our
9
    intention, as we told Defense Counsel, is at some point in the
10
    not too distant future, to seek a superseding indictment
11
    containing at least the additional charges outlined in the
12
    criminal complaint.
13
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. WINDOM: I --
14
15
              THE COURT: Which would materially increase the
16
    alleged fraud laws for guidelines purposes and everything
17
    else?
18
              MR. WINDOM: Back up to -- I had estimated loss at
19
    this point of over 14 million dollars.
20
              THE COURT: Fourteen?
21
              MR. WINDOM: Yes.
22
              THE COURT: Okay.
23
              MR. WINDOM: But, again, given the context, she has
24
    not been indicted on that charge yet. She is contacting the
25
    people that she is ordered not to talk to on that chart.
```

So there is, you know, pages and pages of this. She -- and by the way, we know the burner is her phone, not because there is some subscriber record that says it is her phone. The subscriber record just says Chevy Chase.

One of the people that she called says that she called them on this phone, on this 301 number. So that is how we know it is her phone. And based on what Defense Counsel said a moment ago, I am not sure that they are going to dispute that this is her phone. But we will find out.

Mr. Ridgeway. She needed to find a way to contact people not using her own phone. And even then, she was forced -- for whatever reason -- to resort to using her own phone from time to time to get in touch with folks who maybe they weren't picking up the call because it was some number not in their phone. Who knows? But the vast majority of the contacts are using the burner through the day that these end on September 3rd.

I am putting up on the screen the summary of what that is. This summary does not include the Facetime calls on there. But we are talking about 600 minutes maybe in five days -- six days after she has sworn under penalty of perjury and under threat of contempt of this Court to follow the Court's restrictions. Including not to contact folks.

So we can -- you know, we could go into every single

-- all the rows of these to explain it more. But if Your Honor just want to stick with what the bail review issue was, this is the context. This is why she did it. She did it in order to acquire the phone.

Now what does that mean? So 3148, you got two things. You got both the federal crime, contempt of court, which she said in the release order that she understood, if she violates the order you get -- she could be prosecuted for contempt of court. She signed it. She understands that.

There is also potential witness tampering as well, federal crime.

Second of all, just a violation of her release order. There is obviously probable cause to find that she was in contempt of Judge DiGirolamo's order, which creates the rebuttable presumption in favor of detention. Otherwise, there is clear and convincing evidence that she was in violation of the release order.

There is zero percent chance that we can fashion anything to contain this Defendant. In our argument to Judge DiGirolamo we argued flight risk, sure. We also argued, more strenuously that under 3142 she couldn't be released because she was going to go obstruct, because she was going to go talk to witnesses.

We pointed Judge DiGirolamo to a part in the criminal complaint where she had done just that in relation to

```
one of her employee's SEC testimonies. She was writing down notes in emails about what this guy should say in his testimony.
```

So we relied on that in seeking detention before.

She walked out of the courtroom. She didn't even have to walk out of the courthouse before she proved us right. She used her lawyer's phone to break Judge DiGirolamo's order. She has got to beset that.

THE COURT: So the Government -- your position is that there are just absolutely -- I could -- that even if I locked her down again and made her move to a different address so I could get her on a bracelet and took away her ability to use a cell phone, period -- I don't care about her business or not -- took away her ability to use a cell phone, took away her ability to access internet capable devices, have them all monitored if she was using them at her expense, that all of those, even additional conditions of release, are still not sufficient in terms of the Government's belief that -- I guess your argument at the end of the day is you are moving for detention -- I guess, that she is a serious risk of obstruction, which I can move for it. I mean, anybody -- the Government can do that sua sponte.

MR. WINDOM: Yes.

THE COURT: So is that the argument?

MR. WINDOM: Yes, Your Honor. And it is

demonstratively true. There is no way that you can ensure that a defendant does not get a phone. Especially where there is a propensity to not just get -- you know, use her own phone, but to go get a burner, go use two other people's phones in this. She has visitors at the house. She borrows their phone. She has visitors at the house -- she orders groceries from Giant and put in a phone on the -- you know, at home delivery option, if they have such things. Or CVS home delivery or any of those places, all of which have disposable phones. There is no way to monitor it. There is no way to ensure that she is not going to keep on ---.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Counsel?

MR. SCHAMEL: Giant does have home delivery, Your Honor. If they didn't I wouldn't be near this fat. My wife uses it all the time. It is quite good.

So on the issue of this, the 29th, I think there is a couple of important things to point out. First and foremost, she has been perfectly compliant with Pretrial and they don't have any complaints with her since that day.

I am looking here, again -- this is another document. I am not sure why this was a big secret, but it was handed to me a second before it was handed to you, Your Honor. And it looks like she left the courthouse, was on the phone driving the wrong way. Did get lost, which is consisted with what she told Pretrial. And she was on the phone with people

she is allowed to talk to, including her lawyer for 41 minutes
-- her prior sort of lawyer, not lawyer not any more, lawyer.

The lawyer who told her not to come to court, lawyer.

And it looks like she has missed voicemails from Pretrial. She gets the call from Mr. Gremminger and -- a little bit slow for my liking -- it is 13 minutes later she calls Pretrial later at 5:06 as Pretrial recorded.

What this looks like to me, candidly, is somebody who somebody makes sure they already turn off their phone when they walk into court. I always get yelled at by my wife why I don't answer the phone in the afternoon because I forgot to turn it back on.

She is on the phone. She is making calls. She is making calls -- I don't think she said the phone didn't work. I think the issue was about whether or not it was ringing and coming in to her. And then she has been compliant since on the issue of Pretrial and what is before us.

On the issue of the chart that we just went through, I told Your Honor, I mean, I have had this chart for just about a minute or two more -- maybe eight minutes more than you have had it. So I can't say. Like, I don't know who Mr. Fuentes is or what he would say. I haven't talked to Mr. Collins. I don't know.

I can tell Your Honor that I am not exactly sure I agree with one of the representations Government Counsel made

about an email on the SEC. We can sort of agree to disagree on what that emails says.

So I think, you know, perspective being the driver on some of those things, how you look at them. But I think the more important issue if Your Honor is going to entertain the question as it relates to these -- what they call myriad violations, is 130 calls -- there are conditions. There are sets of conditions. And --

THE COURT: How do you reasonably -- and this is rhetorical, but not really -- how do you reasonably assure that a sophisticated criminal defendant -- and I believe that Ms. Bennett is sophisticated -- and how do you reasonably assure, given what the Government has proffered so far today, that she has the capability and the financial ability to thwart conditions of release and bend them -- and there is no real ability, except for detention -- and by the way, as everybody knows too, there are burners in cell blocks, too. So let's be real about that.

You know, so when somebody is like Ms. Bennett who is a sophisticated business person who -- you know, using other people's phones and calling people that the judge -- the court told her not to call, I mean, how do I fashion any kind of conditions of release that will reasonably ensure that she won't engage in such conduct that, you know, could subject her to obstruction or witness tampering?

And I know you are going to say, I am not that kind of lawyer. I am going to read her the riot act, blah, blah, blah. But, you know, that is not really an answer for me. I mean, what are the least restrictive conditions, other than detention, that can correct this tract record in such a short period of time where it is obvious to me and -- you know, and I take back the fact -- I mean, I don't take it back because she just went the wrong way on the beltway, but -- which I don't understand because she probably came from Chevy Chase there and then she decided to go home the long way. And, you know, when I return to my house in Montgomery County I never go back to Montgomery County by Branch Avenue.

But setting all that aside, it took her two hours to go from this courthouse or from 295 at the BW Parkway -- two hours roughly before she even spoke to Pretrial. And the Government has made a pretty compelling case of what she has been doing. She just doesn't want to follow what Pretrial tells her.

Now she is in compliance, maybe. But what are the conditions of release that, if I am going to change these conditions -- which I can -- what are you suggesting other than detention? Because this is a pretty bad case for Ms. Bennett, in my mind.

MR. SCHAMEL: I think it is a fair assessment, Your Honor. It is a fair read of it.

What I won't say -- and I am not standing up here,
Your Honor, to say like somehow I have magic; right? I am
some different lawyer and so it will different because I say
it will be different. I don't even possess that sort of
hubris to even make that argument.

But what I think is -- and I am often struck when I -- particularly career prosecutors, when they make discussions about let's put people in cages, people need to go to jail, and we need to send to them, whether it is CTF at D.C. or down at Chuck County or someplace -- you know what that actual means, you know? That is what we need to do to this woman. That is where she needs to be until maybe June, or May, or whenever they get around to their superseding indictment and we get a trial date.

It troubles me. It troubles me having been in 50, 60 jails, prisons, you know, county lockups, super-max, to camps. It is -- that is a pretty onerous ask. And it is an onerous ask because not only does it impact her mental health and what she can do to help assist in her own defense, but how difficult it makes it to even put on a case.

And, Your Honor -- I don't have to tell you, you have probably represented more detained defendants than I have in your career. And it is a pretty significant ask.

That is why when they drafted the statute they say let's find what is better. What can we do that is more

```
reasonable? And I think, frankly, at this point, she probably has lost her right to telephone privileges, at least for the foreseeable future. I think that is completely reasonable.

She was living in New Mexico. The reason she has been living here and now is because of this case. I don't
```

Mexico. I am guessing there is a lot of -- never been there.

8 So I am guessing there is a lot of wide open spaces and they

know if the Court wants to put her on monitoring in New

9 don't have any cell --

mean, I really wish I had like 176 acres and a 13-bedroom house and 11-bathroom house in New Mexico that I could live in. I mean, I really wish that which -- I wish I had that.

MR. SCHAMEL: I would take a little one of those adobes out in New Mexico, Judge.

THE COURT: But -- and I don't know why she can't -- Ms. Bennett, please have a seat.

You know, and I don't understand all -- and I say that not because I want to live the life of the rich and famous. I say it because I think it is a part of her scam not to lawyer up. She has got all of these properties. She lives in a penthouse. She has got this house in New Mexico that -- what I saw -- went on the market for nine million dollars at some point and she bought it, apparently.

So, you know, she is very sophisticated. That is

```
nm
   1
      what I meant about sophisticated.
   2
                MR. SCHAMEL: I am not saying she is not. I don't
   3
      disagree --
   4
                THE COURT: And she's a trickster.
   5
                MR. SCHAMEL: I don't think that is fair, Judge. I
  6
      mean, and here is --
   7
                THE COURT: All right. Well, I am the judge. Go
   8
      ahead.
  9
                MR. SCHAMEL: You are. But I am the lawyer.
                                                               I am
  10
      allowed to say that I don't necessarily agree with you.
  11
                THE COURT: On your limited conditional
  12
      representation of a client that you really have -- don't even
  13
      really know yet.
  14
                MR. SCHAMEL: Lawyer for the day, but 20 years of
      practice in criminal defense --
  15
  16
                THE COURT: Go ahead.
  17
                MR. SCHAMEL: -- around this jurisdiction and across
  18
      the country.
  19
                THE COURT: Tell me, sir, what this -- let's not --
  20
      I mean, as much as I enjoy this banter with you, tell me what
  21
      you recommend for Ms. Bennett short of me sending her out that
  22
      door right now because she is a -- she cannot help herself
  23
      from committing obstruction of justice and she has violated
  24
      the release conditions in this case?
```

MR. SCHAMEL: She does not have a phone.

THE COURT: So tell me what I should do.

MR. SCHAMEL: She does not have a phone. It has been taken the federal agents this -- earlier today. She should not be allowed to get --

THE COURT: How doesn't she -- how do we that she doesn't stop at the CVS or the Giant and get a new burner, or have Mr. Fuentes get a new burner, or use somebody else's phone to make calls to people that she can't have contact with? How will we ever -- not me. Because I don't care. How will the Government be able to -- or Pretrial be able to -- it is really Pretrial. How will Pretrial be able to supervise that to make sure that she is compliance with the release conditions?

MR. SCHAMEL: Didn't they just show us that they can? I mean, isn't the proof right there in the pudding? They say she gets a burner phone and they can't supervise her — they have got the phone — and I hate that term, too. She issues of pre-paid tracfone and they say she made all these phone calls to all these people on a prepaid tracfone. So I think there is your answer, Your Honor. It is very — it seems to be — I don't know. I am not the Government. But it seems to be pretty easy to do.

So if she has a very clear, specific order from Your Honor that she is not to purchase any new phones, enter into any phone contracts, borrow anybody's phones, have any phone

use, put her back on GPS monitoring. I mean, I think that is pretty easy. If it is as Mr. Windom would like us to believe that is inescapable that she is going to do it, well, my guess is she would do it tomorrow and we will be back on Monday; right?

They have these 35 people. They are clearly all being talked to by the federal agents. So my guess is none of them -- even the ones who want to speak to her -- are going to lie to federal agents or want to get themselves caught up in some sort of aiding and abetting. She probably already has, given what Government Counsel has told us, pulled some new charges for a superseding indictment on obstruction. They will try to make those charges against her.

But to put her in jail until there is a trial date for a superseding indictment is excessive. It is excessive on the circumstances of this case. It is excessive on this indictment. It is excessive on these allegations.

She is sophisticated. I am not saying she is not.

But I don't think that there is -- the same of having this real estate as the same of liquidity; right? The fact that she is trying to hire lawyers and trying to find a lawyer, and she is probably doing it in short order. And, frankly, may have me as early as early next week.

I think the other thing that the Government is missing -- and I think Your Honor probably knows this as well

as I do as well -- she is now sitting here scared to death for the first time in this case. She has a lawyer, unlike lawyers who say don't bother coming to court, this isn't a big deal, this is just the SEC run a mock, there is nothing to this case, this is stupid, and the things that she had been hearing before Monday.

Now she is hearing I make -- she has heard a federal magistrate judge say, What is to stop me from taking her through that door and putting in a cage for the next six months? That has a pretty significant impact on every human being in the world. So we are in a different place. It is a new paradigm. Your Honor has this case. It is going to stay with Your Honor, I am quite certain. I am going to stay, and if I can, I am going everything I can to make that happen.

And I think Ms. Bennett could not be more crystal clear what the repercussions are.

My guess is, and if Your Honor hasn't said it already or will say, Ms. Bennett, there will not be a third strike. Ms. Bennett, if there is a single -- not 130, not 114, not 98 -- if there is a single violation of my order, which is going to be as clear and as concise as can possibly be, there won't be need for a hearing. You are going to be held pending trial.

I think that is the ramification, Your Honor. I think that is the resolution. I think that, frankly, is what

```
1
    is in the interest of justice.
2
              THE COURT: Mr. Windom, anything else?
              MR. WINDOM: Just briefly, Your Honor.
3
4
              I mean, she is asking for a mulligan which you don't
5
    get on the pro tour and you don't get in Federal Court. She
6
    has been in -- you are the third magistrate judge who the
7
    Defense would have you just tell her the exact thing that two
8
    other magistrate judges have already told her.
9
              In New Mexico she was told by that magistrate judge.
10
    And not just told, but as with all defendants, she signed.
11
    She signed the New Mexico release order saying I recognize I
12
    can't do these things. So then three days later she says, oh,
13
    here --
14
              THE COURT: Do you have the -- can I see a -- do you
15
    have a complete copy of that New Mexico --
16
              MR. WINDOM: Yes, sir. I will hand it up right now.
17
    And I will hand it up with Judge DiGirolamo's order which I am
18
    about to put on the screen.
19
              THE COURT: Yes, I have his. But --
20
              MR. WINDOM: Okay, great. So --
21
              THE COURT: Counsel, do you have the complete --
22
              MR. SCHAMEL: I don't have the New Mexico, Your
23
    Honor.
24
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
25
              MR. WINDOM: Judge DiGirolamo said the exact same
```

24

25

```
nm
   1
      thing --
   2
                THE COURT: Do you have the New Mexico --
   3
                MR. GREMMINGER: I have it, yes.
   4
                MR. SCHAMEL: Oh, ---
                THE COURT: Yes. Your local counsel has it.
   5
   6
                MR. GREMMINGER: It will take me a moment to get it,
   7
      Your Honor.
   8
                THE COURT: Yes, sure. Go ahead.
  9
                MR. SCHAMEL: Local like here?
  10
                MR. WINDOM: So the jest of it is this, she lied to
  11
      two separate magistrate judges, she lied to Mr. Ridgeway's
  12
      face a few hours after she left this courthouse. And she
  13
      presumably lied to her own local counsel when she said, Hey,
  14
      can I borrow your phone, downstairs in this courthouse an hour
  15
      and 42 minutes after walking out of court with Judge D.
  16
                THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anybody else wish to
  17
      say anything?
  18
                All right. So this is a bail review hearing. There
  19
      is really two issues here. One is the representations issue,
  20
      which we will put on the side of a second. But here is the
  21
      reality -- and, Ms. Bennett, I have been sparring with your
  22
      lawyer and -- your conditional limited lawyer and your local
```

counsel lawyer kind of facetiously, but don't overlook the importance of getting a lawyer in a case like this.

I am going to treat you the exact same way that I

treat every single criminal defendant who goes off on -- goes out on release conditions and who violates those release conditions. I have no doubt, and I believe the evidence is sufficient for me to conclude, that you have engaged in conduct that, although may be subject to contempt of court -- the Government can charge you with that if they want and/or obstruction or witness tampering. But what is clear to me, and I don't even have to reach -- I don't even really -- concluding what I am going to do, I don't even really reach any of the no-contact calls and the use of the phones.

Yes, it is really disturbing that you are using your lawyer's phone and making him a co-conspirator to your violation of a federal judge's order. But I don't really even need to go there. I am only going to restrict myself to the note of apparent violation for your conduct with Mr. Ridgeway and it is inexcusable. And you knew exactly what you were doing. The data reflects it. And you were talking to everybody under the sun, except for Mr. Ridgeway.

And you can shake your head all you want. It is not going to make a difference to me.

And that he told you to go directly home and you didn't go directly home. And there are consequences for your conduct. And you are now charged as a criminal defendant and your station in life is irrelevant. And it would be totally, totally, totally, totally inappropriate and wrong for me to

give you a pass on this when I don't give anybody a pass and there is a whole litany of people who know that my philosophy is I will put you out on release, you violate it, you go in.

I don't think that you need to stay in custody for the entire duration of the case. I don't think that you need to stay detained until May, or June, or July, whenever this case comes around. But I do think you think a wakeup call.

And I think you need to be told, and I am about to tell you, that your life is not our own anymore.

You are now a criminal defendant in a federal court case in this district. You can live on a ranch. You can life in a penthouse. It doesn't matter. You are going to be treated the same way that an 18-year-old or a 25-year-old young man who was born and raised in Prince George's County and gets charged here gets treated.

You are going to be detained and remanded to the custody of the Marshal. It is not going to be forever.

Limited counsel or local counsel can file a motion for reconsideration. I am going to put you in for a couple days.

And then I am going to let you back out. And then we are going to talk about a brand new clean slate of release conditions. And there are consequences for noncompliance. It is not the end of the world. You are not -- and I will tell you right now, I don't care what the Government says, they can come -- unless you use a burner phone in the jail, I am not

going to keep you in custody.

I recognize your criminal -- lack of criminal history. I recognize all of the factors that weigh in your advantage for release conditions. And I believe there is a possibility of conditions of release, onerous, suspect to whether or not you are going to comply with them or try to bend them and do your own thing and think that what I say doesn't matter. But I am not Judge DiGirolamo. And I am not some judge -- one of my colleagues in New Mexico.

You bare responsibility for your conduct, which is violating Judge DiGirolamo's order. You are going to pay the consequences for that and I do find right now, just on the obstruction alone -- setting that aside -- forget it. Under 3148 I find that you have violated the release conditions set by Judge DiGirolamo. And at this point in time, I find that there are grounds to believe that you are highly, highly unlikely to abide by any of the conditions, particularly the no-contact order. And you are going to be detained and remanded to the custody of the Marshal.

And, you know, we can talk with Counsel about setting this in sometime rather quickly. But you need to go in and you need to think about following release conditions.

And I put people in for smoking weed. You know, that -- marijuana is a federal crime. You test dirty, good bye. And I don't see the reasons why I should treat you any different

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

than anyone else.

I understand that your lawyer is saying and he is great. He has done a great job for you. But there are consequences for your conduct and right now you are detained and remanded to the custody of the Marshal. And at the appropriate time, somebody can file a motion and ask me to reconsider. We will file -- we will set this in for a hearing and we will move forward then and set a new set of conditions of release that you may well think you could just stay in jail because they are going to be -- you are a hard case to figure out because you are very smart, the allegations against you are very serious, and you are clever. And I just see it from the record here. And it is going to be a challenge for me to fashion release conditions that are appropriate for you, but I am willing to do that and am willing to give it a try. But I think right now detention is appropriate.

Ma'am, you are remanded into the custody of the Marshal.

Any other medical issues that your client has while she is in custody?

MR. SCHAMEL: That is exactly what I was going to ask, Your Honor. I haven't had a --

THE COURT: On the -- yes, just on the corner of the table there so we don't say it out loud -- but on the defense table there is a communication of health claims form. So just

```
1
    have a seat with your -- just fill it out with her so we don't
    have to say it in court in front of everybody and I will look
3
    at it.
4
              MR. SCHAMEL: Right now while we are at the counsel
5
    table?
6
              THE COURT: Yes.
7
              MR. SCHAMEL: Okay.
8
              THE COURT: See, there is a form there, right, that
9
    says Communication of Health Needs?
10
              MR. SCHAMEL: Oh, I didn't see that. Okay.
11
              THE COURT: Yes. So just fill that out with
12
    Ms. Bennett and then pass it up to me.
13
              MR. SCHAMEL: Your Honor, may we -- could -- I would
14
    ask while we are filling that out because I do think there is
15
    a couple issues that he is going to put down -- Mr. Gremminger
16
    is going to put down. Can we stay this until tomorrow that
17
    she can -- wherever she is going to be remanded so that she
18
    can -- if there is medications and things that need to be
19
    done?
20
              THE COURT: No. Let's see what the health -- I have
21
    got people with bypass, I have got people with -- I got
22
    another set of lawyers here that are waiting that -- I have
23
    people who are in custody all the time with kidney disease,
24
    all kinds of heart disease, diabetes, cancer. So no, I am not
25
    staying it. She is going in tonight. But just let me see
```

what is on the form.

And while you are filling that out, Counsel, I am going to grant Ms. Gremminger's motion to withdraw. I mean, sir, so your motion ECF number 20 where you have asked to be relieved from any other responsibility in this matter is granted.

MR. GREMMINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And you are no longer required to attend any hearings and/or any proceedings in this unless you want to reenter your appearance. But I have granted the motion and you are discharged from any other further responsibility.

MR. GREMMINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Schamel, --

MR. SCHAMEL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- if you can multitask, I need an answer from you sooner than later about whether you are going to be retained by Ms. Bennett to represent her. And I will -- if you want to continue that discussion with her, I will ask the Marshals to make sure she is available to him after these proceedings so you can talk about what you need to talk about.

I don't want her -- she needs to be represented by an attorney. If she can't work out rule one with you, I need to get her back quickly for an attorney inquiry hearing and consider the appointment of counsel for her under a contribution order because she needs to be represented, and I

```
1
    don't want her to be unrepresented for any period of time.
2
              But Mr. Gremminger, he doesn't need to stay.
3
    is like he wakes up in cold sweats at night thinking about
4
    what he got himself into. So I am keeping you in as your --
5
    you are now -- your limited conditional representation is
6
    going to carry on moving forward until such time as you advise
7
    me that it is not going to work out. And then I will figure
8
    out what we are going to do about an attorney.
9
              Or if you are going to enter -- and you work out the
10
    financial component of it, just enter just the normal notice
11
    of appearance on the system and we will take it from there.
12
    But I would like for you -- I don't know if the timetable is
13
    too tight, but I would like to know by like close of business
14
    tomorrow whether you are in or out. I don't know if that is
15
    too close -- too tight for you guys or --
16
              MR. SCHAMEL: May I approach on that issue, Your
17
    Honor? Do you mind?
18
              THE COURT: Sure, if you want.
19
              MR. SCHAMEL:
                            Thank you.
20
                         Do you want the Government to come up or
              THE COURT:
21
    no?
22
              MR. SCHAMEL: No, I would like to just do ex parte
23
    on that issue.
24
              THE COURT: Okay, yes.
                                      Sure. All right.
25
              (Whereupon, a Bench Conference followed.)
```

```
1
              MR. SCHAMEL: --- I am concerned about this.
    of the investors hired a lawyer to try to find her a lawyer.
3
    They are trying to put together -- the investors are trying to
4
    hire somebody to represent ---. And so I don't know if ---.
5
              THE COURT: All right. When do you want -- when do
6
    you want me --
7
              MR. SCHAMEL: Well, I don't know how good --- doing
    that --- at this point. So I don't know that I will see you
9
    for Monday. And now with her being detained it is going to
10
    certainly impact that.
11
              THE COURT: But she is not detained forever, but --
12
              MR. SCHAMEL: No, I understand.
13
              THE COURT: -- right now --
14
              MR. SCHAMEL: I hear what you saying. But I -- and
15
    I certainly wouldn't leave her high and dry.
16
              THE COURT: Right.
17
              MR. SCHAMEL: If I am not going to --- I will stay
18
    until I file a motion to reconsider.
19
              THE COURT: Okay. All right.
20
              MR. SCHAMEL: I will do all that. There is a
21
    meeting that I --- tomorrow and it is for a hearing Monday.
22
    And then we are moving this week and I just don't know when I
23
    am going to get to the jail to see her.
24
              THE COURT: Yes. No, I understand that. So, yes, I
25
    think we are on the same -- I am going to give you enough time
```

```
1
    to figure out whether you can stay to represent her or to stay
    on the case or not. So it doesn't have to be by Friday.
    let me know sometime next week what the status is.
3
4
              MR. SCHAMEL: I will. And I am going to try to talk
5
    to Government Counsel and see if they have --- subpoena all
6
    the lawyers --- --
7
              THE COURT: Right.
8
              MR. SCHAMEL: -- frequently hear of lawyers so want
9
    three million dollars these days.
10
              THE COURT: Right. Right.
              MR. SCHAMEL: --- a million dollars to do the SEC
11
12
    stuff. And then --- come forward. So I got to --- my
13
    position and stuff. --- talk to them. I will figure out
14
    tomorrow.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. That is fine.
16
              MR. SCHAMEL: But then I will -- you have my word
17
    that I still stay in until we get something figured out.
18
              THE COURT: Okay. All right.
19
              MR. SCHAMEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
              THE COURT: You are welcome.
21
              (Whereupon, the Bench Conference was concluded.)
22
              THE COURT: All right, so based on the ex parte
23
    conversation at the bench, I am not going to set a deadline --
24
    a firm hard deadline for Counsel to advise whether he is going
25
    to enter a full appearance.
```

```
1
              And, Counsel, just let me know when you know.
    Hopefully next week. And you will -- he -- you will stay in
3
    the case representing the interests of Ms. Bennett up until
4
    such time either, you are no longer in the case or you are in
    fully. Okay?
5
6
              MR. SCHAMEL: Yes, Your Honor. That is totally
7
    appropriate.
8
              THE COURT: All right.
9
              Government, anything else?
10
              MR. WINDOM: No, Your Honor.
11
              THE COURT: All right.
12
              MR. SCHAMEL: And then may I -- you said -- may I
13
    speak with her before she is taken back? Is there a place
    that I can talk to the Marshals?
14
15
              THE COURT: Yes. The Marshall will -- they will
16
    take her back downstairs and then you can talk to her
17
    downstairs.
18
              Do you have the health need form that I can look at?
19
              MR. SCHAMEL: Yes. I am going to bring that up now,
20
    Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Great.
22
              MR. WINDOM: Your Honor, may we see you separately
23
    and may we take a break for a few minutes?
24
              THE COURT: Sure.
25
              MR. WINDOM: Thank you.
```

```
87
nm
   1
                THE COURT: Let me just do the health needs form
      first and then --
   3
                MR. WINDOM: Yes.
   4
                MR. SCHAMEL: May I approach?
   5
                THE COURT: Yes. You can just pass it to me.
   6
                (Pause.)
   7
                THE COURT: All right. Let's move it on.
   8
                All right, we will take a five minute recess. And I
  9
      apologize to everybody else who is waiting.
  10
                All right, you guys, come on back.
  11
                THE CLERK: All rise. This Honorable Court stands
  12
      in recess.
  13
                 (Whereupon, at 3:46 p.m., the proceeding concludes.)
  14
  15
  16
  17
  18
  19
  20
  21
  22
  23
  24
  25
```

## 

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the duplicated electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Noemy Martinez 10/18/2017
Noemy Martinez Date

Transcriber